

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
Public Law 107-110

ESEA Title II, Part B

Montana

Mathematics and Science
Partnership (MSP) Program

2006 Competitive Grant Application

Due Date: May 1, 2006



Linda McCulloch, Superintendent
Montana Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
www.opi.mt.gov

Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program Competitive Grants 2006

GENERAL APPLICATION INFORMATION

TIMELINE	
March 20, 2006	Applications posted on OPI Web site and statewide dissemination.
April 3-14, 2006	Technical Assistance Workshops – See web site for dates and times: http://www.opi.mt.gov/TitleIIPartB/Index.html
May 1, 2006	Applications postmarked by this date or received by the OPI by 5:00 p.m.
May 1-19, 2006	Application Review Process
May 26, 2006	Grant Awards Announced
June – 2006	Mandatory Project Director and Partner Meeting in Helena
July 1, 2006	Project funds become available to awardees
This is a federal program and sub-grant reporting dates and requirements are subject to change as federal requirements change.	

I. GENERAL GRANT INFORMATION

TYPES OF GRANTS AVAILABLE

Category 1 – Continuation Grants – Current MSP projects may apply for a one-year continuation grant in accordance with **Section III E**. Maximum funding for these continuation grants will be **\$75,000**. Continuation grants that can demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in accordance with the criteria provided may be renewed for a second year. Maximum award amount for the second year will be **\$75,000**. Up to three continuation grants will be awarded for the first year.

Category 2 – New Partnership Grants – New or existing partnerships may submit an application for a two-year grant in accordance with the criteria below. Maximum funding for these two-year grants will be **\$175,000** per year for each of the two years. Up to three new partnership grants will be awarded for the first year.

Funds Available: Grant funds for either Category 1 and/or Category 2 will be available July 1, 2006. Grant funds are contingent upon availability of federal funds.

Unless otherwise stated, all requirements below apply to both Category 1 and Category 2 projects.

REVIEW PROCESS

The application review process will consist of (1) an external review by a panel of educators experienced in reading similar grant proposals who will score the applications; and (2) a review by an OPI team that will make necessary policy decisions regarding the award.

Appendix F provides the basic rubric that will be used as part of the review process. Along with the numerical score, each reviewer will list the strengths and weaknesses of the responses to each part. A grant accepted for funding may require project and budget revisions before final approval and funding is released. **Applicants will be notified by May 26, 2006 as to whether a proposal has been selected for funding.**

The original and four copies of the completed grant application must be postmarked by May 1, 2006.

Address your application packets to:

**Al Mc Milin, Educator Quality Program Specialist
Office of Public Instruction
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501**

Because of the possibility of Electronic messaging failure, faxed applications will not be accepted.

PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

Funds awarded through these sub grants are subject to the requirements of Section 14503 of ESEA P.L. 108-382 (Participation by Private School Children and Teachers) and the regulations in 34 CFR 299, Subpart E. The statute and regulations require that sub grantees provide private schools in their area the opportunity for meaningful collaboration with the sub grantees during the planning process for any subsequent professional development activities. Further, the sub grantees must provide private school children and their teachers, or other educational personnel, the opportunity to receive services and benefits of the program on an equitable basis with public school children and teachers.

DURATION OF GRANTS

Grant awards beyond the first year are subject to Federal appropriations, compliance with program requirements, demonstration of effectiveness and timely reporting of findings and budgets by the partnerships.

SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT

Funds received shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds that would otherwise be used for proposed activities.

SUBSEQUENT OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY

The Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is committed to the competitive process required by this program. Awards will be made only for high-quality proposals that describe programs that attend to all competition requirements. There is no obligation on the part of the OPI to award all the available funds in the first round of competition. Pending the results of the initial grant competition, a second round of the competition may be announced after the 2006 awards.

GRANT WRITING ASSISTANCE

The OPI will provide technical assistance workshops for interested applicants. The purpose of these workshops is to build applicant capacity to address the expectations of the grants and the activities eligible for funding. Throughout the process, applicants with questions can contact:

Al Mc Milin, Educator Quality Program Specialist
Office of Public Instruction
Telephone: (406) 444-4436
E-mail: amcmilin@mt.gov

II. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND ON MSP PROGRAM

In January 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) became law. ESEA Title II, Part B of this legislation authorizes the Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) competitive grant program. The purpose of this program is to improve the academic achievement of students in the areas of mathematics and science by encouraging State education agencies, institutions of higher education, local education agencies, elementary schools, and secondary schools to participate in programs that improve instruction and upgrade the status and stature of mathematics and science teaching.

The Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is responsible for the administration of this program. This year **\$800,000** is available for the Title II Part B Mathematics and Science Partnerships competitive grant program. Funds will be awarded by the OPI to support successful proposals submitted by Montana Institutes of Higher Education (IHE), school districts, Montana regionalized educational service providers (Western Montana Partnership for Educational Resources (WMPER), Montana North Central Educational Services Region (MNCESR)) or nonprofit organizations (NPO), that have formed eligible partnerships as outlined in **Section III B.** that are focused on the improvement of mathematics and science instruction through the process of implementing high-quality professional development. **School districts may also use Title I and Title II Part A funds to support the partnership's activities to demonstrate progress toward meeting the district partner's NCLB Title I Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals.**

III. MONTANA MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. General Goals of the Montana MSP Program

Overall Goals:

Overall Goal 1: Improve student achievement in mathematics and science.

Overall Goal 2: Foster a commitment by districts and arts-and-science faculty that they have **joint responsibility** for improving mathematics and science instruction through the process of designing and implementing high-quality professional development.

Overall Goal 3: Support and coordinate with Montana's ongoing continuous improvement process as provided for in the Five-Year Comprehensive Education Plan (5YCEP) project. Where applicable MSP projects need to support and focus on the goals of the American Indian Achievement Gap initiative.

Overall Goal 4: Provide professional development that has significant and meaningful mathematics and science content which models the instructional strategies that will enable teachers to teach in a manner that will improve student achievement in mathematics and science.

Overall Goal 5: Develop effective programs to prepare a math or science teacher from a participating LEA to return to a school or district and provide professional development to other math or science teachers, including (if applicable) a mechanism to integrate the teacher's experiences from a summer institute. Such a mechanism must also include a component that insures the involvement of building and district leadership.

Enabling Goals:

Enabling Goal 1: Focus on the education of mathematics and science teachers as a career-long process that continuously stimulates teachers' intellectual growth and upgrades teachers' knowledge and skills.

Enabling Goal 2: Bring mathematics and science teachers in elementary schools and secondary schools together with scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to increase the subject matter knowledge of mathematics and science teachers and improve teachers' teaching skills through the use of sophisticated laboratory equipment and work space.

Enabling Goal 3: Develop more concise and rigorous mathematics and science instructional resources that are precisely aligned to Montana and local academic content standards and with the standards expected for preparation of students for postsecondary study in engineering, mathematics and science.

Enabling Goal 4: Provide support for cohorts of math teachers, science teachers or combinations of math and science teachers made up of teachers within one eligible district; from a region or from statewide who will engage with IHE STEM faculty in a two-week summer institute and follow-up training as outlined in **Section III D**. A cohort size needs to be restricted enough to concentrate resources to insure high-quality professional development.

Enabling Goal 5: Improve and expand the training of mathematics and science teachers in the effective integration of technology in to curricula and instruction.

Enabling Goal 6: Provide support for the rigorous evaluation of professional development programs provided by the Montana Title II Part B MSP awards and the subsequent impact on the academic achievement of the students of teachers in these programs.

B. Eligible Partnerships

An eligible partnership **must** include:

1. at least one high need local educational agency (LEA) as defined in **Section VI A**;
2. a science, technology, engineering or math (STEM) department of an institution of higher education including 4 year universities, 2 year technical colleges, tribal colleges, or community college; and
3. a teacher education department of an institution of higher education.

An eligible partnership **may** also include:

1. a Montana regionalized educational service provider (WMPER or MNCESR) if any LEA involved is served by that provider (a qualifying provider **must** be invited to participate);
2. additional LEAs;
3. an applicable NPO; and/or
4. an applicable private school.

C. Required Core Planning Team

All projects **must** have a core planning team in place to oversee the general design and implementation of the project. At a minimum the team will consist of:

1. a teacher from each of the targeted subject areas (math, science) and grade band (elementary, middle school, high) from one or more of the partner LEAs;
2. a building principal or district superintendent from one of the partner LEAs;
3. a participating STEM faculty member;
4. a science or math education faculty member; and
5. the project evaluator.

D. Required Summer Institute

All **Category 2** project proposals **must** include a summer institute model that:

1. is not less than two weeks in length.
2. provides professional development that has significant and meaningful mathematics and science content to be taught by current STEM faculty and that improves the content knowledge of the participating teachers.
3. provides professional development that models the research based instructional strategies that will enable teachers to teach in a manner that can improve the level of student achievement in math and/or science.
4. provides professional development in **one** particular research based instructional strategy that complements and supports the content knowledge instruction that when implemented will enable teachers to teach in a manner that can improve student achievement in math and/or science.
5. provides professional development that will enhance the ability of the teacher to understand and use the challenging Montana academic content standards for math and/or science.
6. includes a component that allows the K-12 teachers to work with curriculum and instructional material that is in current use or is being developed or planned, for use in their respective districts.
7. provides for follow-up professional development during the academic year that is conducted in the classroom for a period of not less than **two** hours on at least **four** separate days. If the teacher(s) is located in a rural school setting, the follow-up training may be conducted using distance learning.

Note: There is no expectation of a summer institute until 2007 to allow for adequate planning and preparation. However, a project is not prohibited from developing an institute for the summer of 2006 as long as all guidelines are met.

E. Required Focus for Category 1 Projects

Current MSP projects applying for a **Category 1** continuation grant **must** design and implement an effective program that prepares a math or science teacher from a participating LEA to return to a school or district and provide professional development to other math or science teachers, including a mechanism to integrate the teacher's experience from a summer institute. The program developed must account for the following:

1. The direct involvement of building and if applicable, district administration;
2. The detailing of the knowledge and skills the returning teacher leader will need and how those are accounted for in the program;
3. The analysis and understanding of the "context" to which the teacher leader will be returning and the necessary modifications of the professional development that may be required given that context;
4. The analysis of the needed school and/or district infrastructure, applicable policy changes and other support resources and how those will be provided if not already present;
5. The outline of the support resources to be provided by the project; and
6. An outline of the process to monitor and adjust/refine the professional development during the implementation.

F. Required Evaluation Support

A qualified project evaluator **must** be utilized by each recipient of either a Category 1 or 2 grant for the formative and summative evaluation of the project in accordance with federal and state guidelines.

IV. POSSIBLE USES OF FUNDS AS MAY BE APPLICABLE GIVEN A CATEGORY 1 OR 2 GRANT

1. Provide for the required summer institute to include such things as faculty and teacher stipends, travel costs, materials, etc.
2. Provide for follow-up training and/or coaching subsequent to the summer institutes.
3. Provide for the continued support and integration costs given the required focus of Category 1 grant projects. This could be such things as release time costs, coaching support, materials development, etc.
4. Core planning team costs.
5. Project director's expenses to coordinate and supervise the overall project; to coordinate teacher participant recruitment; to facilitate STEM faculty recruitment and support; to facilitate math and/or science education faculty recruitment and support, etc.
6. Purchase required evaluation services.

V. CATEGORY 2 GRANT PROPOSALS – PREFERENCES

1. Bonus points (1-9) will be given to projects that incorporate increased STEM faculty interaction with the K-12 classroom teacher by providing for a mechanism for the ongoing dialogue with project teachers through appropriate electronic medium and by providing opportunity for classroom visitation by STEM faculty.
2. Bonus points (1-9) will be given to projects that provide a strong emphasis on building/enhancing professional learning communities in partner schools and districts.
3. Bonus points (1-9) will be given to projects that provide a substantial training component for participating teachers in the effective integration of technology in to curricula and instruction.
4. Bonus points (1-9) will be given to projects that link project outcomes with subsequent considerations for informed modifications in IHE pre-service math and/or science education curriculum.

VI. OTHER APPLICABLE DEFINITIONS

A. HIGH-NEED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The term "high-need school district" means a school district that (1) serves no fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line or a school district for which 20 percent of the children are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **OR** (2) has a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; **OR** has a high percentage of teachers with Emergency Authorization of Employment or Alternative License when compared to other districts in the state.

B. HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER

The Montana Office of Public Instruction defines the term "highly qualified" to mean a teacher who is fully licensed and endorsed in the field in which he/she teaches.

VII. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND PREPARATION OF APPLICATION

- A. **COVER PAGE** – Use the form provided in Appendix A of the RFP. The cover page is the first page of the application.
- B. **ABSTRACT** – Provide an abstract of the proposal that briefly and concisely describes the program to be implemented and summarizes the intended results of the program. Please keep this abstract between 200-300 words.
- C. **PARTNERSHIP OPERATIONAL NARRATIVE**

The partnership narrative **must** address each of the following items.

1. Partnership Makeup and Core Planning Team – The partnership narrative should summarize the makeup of the required planning team and how the team plans to operate.
2. Needs Assessment – A **Category 2** partnership narrative should indicate a clear understanding of results of a needs assessment and how the goals and activities of the partnership's proposed programs are directly related to those needs.
3. Research Base – The partnership narrative should discuss and cite the current state of knowledge relevant to the proposed program. This brief literature review should clearly indicate why the proposed activities were selected or designed. If the proposal builds on prior grant or other project work, the narrative should indicate what was learned from this work and how these lessons are incorporated in the proposed program.
4. Project Plan – The partnership narrative must clearly describe the goals and objectives (please include a logic map) for the program and a detailed summary of the responsibility of each partner. The narrative should include time frame, resources, responsible persons and evaluation component. In addition, provide descriptions of the number, type, duration and scope of planned professional development work, including the number of teachers engaged. (A table format is suggested for laying out this information.)
5. Alignment with Montana Standards and 5YCEP Process – The partnership narrative should clearly explain the tie between the professional development, the standards and the 5YCEP process.
6. Coordination with Other Existing Programs and Initiatives – Where applicable, the partnership narrative should clearly explain how the project is coordinating with other improvement efforts and projects in the respective schools and districts including the American Indian Achievement Gap initiative.
7. Management Capability – The partnership narrative must clearly demonstrate that the partnership has the capability of managing the program, organizing the work and meeting deadlines.
8. Communication – A **Category 2** partnership narrative needs to establish how the project will utilize the electronic mediums (Web site, e-mail, video conferencing, etc.) to provide for ongoing communication and interaction between the participants, faculty, and partners.
9. Leadership Involvement – The partnership narrative must clearly indicate how the project will involve building and district leadership.
10. Implementation and Sustainability of Professional Development – A **Category 2** partnership narrative must clearly describe how the project plans to insure support for implementation and sustainability of the training provided participants once they return to their schools and districts.

11. Project Continuation – The partnership narrative must describe a **clear, detailed** and **comprehensive** plan as to how the partnership will continue the project activities beyond the period of the original grant.

D. PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

1. The partnership's plan must describe how the effectiveness of the partnership itself will be assessed both during the development and operation time frames.
2. The partnership's plan must describe how it will evaluate the overall success of the project (summative). In general, the partnership plan must explain how it will determine whether the partnership activities have increased teacher content knowledge and are contributing to the improvement of student achievement in math and/or science. In particular, the plan must include measurable objectives to increase the number of mathematics and science teachers participating in the professional development activities **and** include measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement on Montana mathematics and science assessments.
3. The partnership plan must also describe how it will measure progress toward meeting its objectives (formative). Mid-term and annual reports on progress related to this outcome will be reviewed by the project evaluator and provided to the Montana Office of Public Instruction on an annual basis.
4. The partnership needs to reference the professional development evaluation model developed by Thomas Guskey attached at **Appendix F** as a guideline for evaluating the professional development project. Evaluation of each of the five levels needs to be reflected somewhere in the overall evaluation plan of the partnership.
5. Each partnership must describe how the results of various formative and summative evaluations will be disseminated to the partnership and to other possible venues.
6. The Montana Office of Public Instruction will provide ongoing training and support for projects that use Montana Surveys of Enacted Curriculum as part of their assessment portfolio.

E. PARTNERSHIP BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE

The budget narrative needs to be clearly tied to the plan summarized in the Partnership Operational Narrative. The budget narrative should describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the overall project budget page and for each of the partner funding request pages submitted (Appendix D). Include a budget for each of the two years of the proposed program. The **Category 1** partnership needs to set aside at least **\$3,000** and the **Category 2** partnership at least **\$5,000** for travel to state and regional MSP conferences.

F. PROPOSAL APPENDICES

The proposal appendices should include only the following documents:

1. Cover Page,
2. Statement of Assurances (**prime applicants other than school districts must contact OPI for proper common assurance forms required for submission with the proposal**) ,
3. Partnership Identification Forms,
4. Budget Forms,
5. Letter of Commitment from Each Partner, and
6. Partner Funding Request for Each Partner.

VIII. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

A. GENERAL GUIDELINES

As proposals are received at the OPI, they will be reviewed by staff for completeness and compliance with the requirements set forth in ESEA Title II, Part B of NCLB to determine applicant eligibility. Any questions about significant omissions from a proposal or about applicant eligibility will be referred to the proposing organization. If, in the judgment of the OPI, a proposal is late, significantly incomplete, or an applicant cannot establish its eligibility, the proposal will be omitted from consideration. The decision of the OPI is final. Applicants submitting proposals that are withdrawn due to incompleteness or ineligibility will be notified in writing.

A review panel will evaluate eligible applications on the basis of the required application components and the established criteria. The review panel will assess each eligible application and make recommendations to the OPI in the areas of program, budget, and efficacy. The review panel's scores and recommendations will be the primary determinant of successful proposals and will form the basis for negotiation and final selection. Following the review, the OPI staff will contact eligible project directors to discuss any modifications of the project plan that may be required. The OPI will seek to fund those proposals that show the most promise for successful professional development programs.

B. SCORING

The panel of reviewers will assess each plan. Each aspect or part of the plan will be worth a set number of points (See charts below). Individual panel members will evaluate each aspect and assign points up to the maximum for each aspect. They will be asked to list strengths and weaknesses for each aspect as well. Finally, the OPI review team will review the scored applications; add in bonus points earned; total the scores; and then make necessary policy decisions regarding the successful awards to grantees.

Category 1 Grant – Proposal Aspect	Maximum Points
Overall Design and Efficacy of Project Plan	27
Makeup, Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	18
Quality of Evaluation and Accountability Plan	27
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	18
Total Possible Points	90

Category 2 Grant – Proposal Aspect	Maximum Points
Overall Design and Efficacy of Project Plan	36
Makeup, Commitment and Capacity of Partnership	18
Quality of Summer Institute Design	27
Quality/Level of Implementation and Sustainability Support for the Participants Following Summer Institute	18
Quality of Evaluation and Accountability Plan	27
Budget and Cost Effectiveness	18
Bonus Points (OPI Assigned)	36
Total Possible Points	180

Appendix A - Cover Sheet

Montana Office of Public Instruction
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

MONTANA MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIP (MSP) PROGRAM
APPLICATION

Applying Institution or Organization: _____

Program Title: _____

Check One: Category 1 Grant _____ Category 2 Grant _____

Program Director

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Zip Code: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

E-Mail: _____

Amount of MSP Funds Requested: \$ _____

Number of Teachers to Be Served Directly: _____

Certification by Authorized or Institutional Official:

The applicant certifies that to the best of his/her knowledge the information in this application is correct, that the filing of this application is duly authorized by the governing body of this organization, or institution, and that the applicant will comply with the attached statement of assurances.

Typed or Printed Name of Authorized Official Grants
Officer or Superintendent of Fiscal Agent

Title

Signature of Authorized Official

Date

Montana Office of Public Instruction
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND FOR THE GRANT'S PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Current research supports the belief that in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and student learning, high-quality professional development programs must contain the following key elements. Professional development programs created through this grant need to provide for these same elements.

1. The programs need to be classroom focused and enhance the capacity of local teachers to enact curricular reforms that produce higher student achievement in core academic areas.
2. The programs need to recognize that effective and lasting changes in professional beliefs and practices require time; multiple learning opportunities; and appropriate and adequate organizational support.
3. The programs need to both facilitate the growth of a teacher's subject matter knowledge and increase a teacher's understanding and use of effective, scientifically research based instructional strategies.
4. The programs need to provide activities and training that reflect sound research and theory but are clearly grounded in the practice of teaching and learning.
5. The programs need to employ a variety of professional development styles that both engage the individual teacher's strengths but also support and enhance the development of a "learning community" where teachers work in collaborative and mutually supportive environment.
6. The programs need to be of sufficient duration (a minimum of 30 hrs) to actively engage the participant and insure lasting impact.
7. The programs need to connect with and build upon, improvement efforts already ongoing in the participant's school and district.
8. The programs need to allow the participant to utilize curriculum and classroom materials from the participant's school and district.
9. The programs need to provide for specific and targeted resources to insure there is adequate support for implementation and subsequent sustainability of the professional development.
10. The programs need to emphasize the involvement of school and district administration.
11. The programs need to be data driven.

Professional Development

As defined by ARM 10.55.714, "professional development" means instructional related activities that:

1. are focused on teachers as central to student learning, yet include all other members of the school community;
2. are focused on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement;
3. respect and nurture the intellectual and leadership capacity of teachers, principals and others in the school community;
4. reflects proven scientifically based research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership;
5. enable teachers to develop further experience in state content standards and assessment, teaching strategies, use of technologies, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards;

6. promotes continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of schools;
7. is ongoing and sustained;
8. is planned collaboratively by those who will participate in and facilitate that development;
9. requires substantial time and resources;
10. is driven by a coherent long-term plan; and
11. is evaluated ultimately on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning, and this assessment guides subsequent professional development efforts.

Scientifically Based Research

The term “scientifically based research” means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs and includes research that:

1. employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment and involve rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
2. relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
3. is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions, with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest and with a preference for random-assignment experiments or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
4. ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
5. has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

Appendix C – Partnership Identification Form
--

*Montana Office of Public Instruction
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program*

PARTNERSHIP IDENTIFICATION FORM

Include a Partnership Identification Form for each of the partner institutions/organizations.

PARTNER INSTITUTION: _____

Contact Name/Title: _____

Contact Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____

E-Mail: _____

Type of Institution/Organization: _____

Partner School District Demographics (If Applicable):

Appendix D – Budget Forms

Montana Office of Public Instruction
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

Budget
Partnership Funding Request

Program Title:

Direct Cost Requested for Partner	YR 1	YR 2	TOTAL
1. Salaries & Wages (Professional and Clerical)			
2. Employee Benefits			
3. Travel in State			
4. Travel Out of State			
5. Materials and Supplies			
6. Consultants and Contracts			
7. Teacher Stipends			
8. Equipment (Purchase)			
9. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)			
B. Indirect Costs* (if appropriate)			
Total Budget			
OPI Use Only: Approved By/Date			

*The indirect cost rate shall not exceed the indirect cost rate for the partner with the lowest indirect cost rate.

This form is a required element of the grant application. Justification for each of the categories shall be included in the budget narrative portion of the application. Modifications to the grant must be reflected over the two years of the grant and included as part of the annual reporting. Annual reapplication is required for continuation of funding for all grants. For reporting, you must include an itemized breakdown of these budget categories and a budget narrative explaining how you calculated each line item and the actual total project cost share.

Appendix D – Budget Forms

Montana Office of Public Instruction

ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

Budget Partner Funding Request

Name of Partner Organization:

On this form, list only the funding this partner will receive from the grant.

Direct Cost Requested for Partner	YR 1	YR 2	<i>TOTAL</i>
1. Salaries & Wages (Professional and Clerical)			
2. Employee Benefits			
3. Travel in State			
4. Travel Out of State			
5. Materials and Supplies			
6. Consultants and Contracts			
7. Teacher Stipends			
8. Equipment (Purchase)			
9. Other (Equipment Rental, Printing, etc.)			
<i>Total Funding to Partner from Grant</i>			

Appendix E – Statement of Assurances

Montana Office of Public Instruction
ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

STATEMENT OF ESEA TITLE II, PART B ASSURANCES

Should an award of funds from the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) Program be made to the applicant in support of the activities proposed in this application, the authorized signature on the cover page of this application certifies to the OPI that the authorized official will:

1. Upon request, provide the Montana Office of Public Instruction with access to records and other sources of information that may be necessary to determine compliance with appropriate federal and state laws and regulations.
2. Conduct educational activities funded by this project in compliance with the following federal laws:
 - a. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
 - b. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972
 - c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
 - d. Age Discrimination Act of 1975
 - e. Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
 - f. Improving America's Schools Act of 1994
3. Use grant funds to supplement and not supplant funds from nonfederal sources.
4. Take into account during the development of programming the need for greater access to and participation in the targeted disciplines by students from historically underrepresented and underserved groups.
5. Submit, in accordance with stated guidelines and deadlines, all program and evaluation reports required by the U.S. Department of Education and the Montana Office of Public Instruction.
6. The applicant will retain records of the program for five years and will allow access to those records for purposes of review and audit.

Signature Information for Appendix A Cover Page with School Districts as Prime Applicant: The Board of Trustees submitted a Common Assurances form to the Office of Public Instruction for the 2005-2006 school year, and no circumstances affecting the validity of the assurances have changed since its submittal. Further, the Board of Trustees has certified that the Common Assurances for Federal Programs are accepted as the basic conditions for local participation and assistance in operation of this Title II Part B MSP Program.

Appendix F – Levels of PD Evaluation

Professional Development Evaluation

Adapted from *Evaluating Professional Development* by Thomas R. Guskey

EVALUATION LEVEL	QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED	MEASURE	WHAT IS MEASURED?	HOW WILL INFORMATION BE USED?
1 PARTICIPANTS' REACTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did they like it? Was their time well-spent? Did the material make sense? Will it be useful? Was the leader knowledgeable and helpful? Were the refreshments fresh and tasty? Was the room the right temperature? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionnaires or surveys administered at the end of the session. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial satisfaction with the experience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve professional development program design and delivery.
2 PARTICIPANTS' LEARNING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did participants acquire the intended knowledge and skills? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paper-and-pencil instruments. Simulations. Demonstrations. Participant reflections (oral and/or written). Participant portfolios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New knowledge and skills of participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve instructional practice To demonstrate the impact of professional development
3 ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND CHANGE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were sufficient resources made available? Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently? Was implementation advocated, facilitated, and supported? Were successes recognized and shared? Was the support public and overt? What was the impact on the organization? Did it affect organizational climate and procedures? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes from follow-up meetings. Questionnaires. Structured interviews with participants and district or school administrators. District and school records. Participant portfolios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organization's advocacy, support, accommodation facilitation, and recognition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To document and improve organizational support. To inform future change efforts.
4 PARTICIPANTS' USE OF NEW KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questionnaires. Structured interviews with participants and their supervisors. Participant reflections (oral and/or written). Participant portfolios. Direct observations. Video or audiotapes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree and quality of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To document and improve the implementation of program content. To demonstrate the impact of professional development
5 STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the impact on the students? Did it affect student performance or achievement? Did it influence student's physical or emotional well-being? Are students more confident as learners? Is Student Attendance improving? Are dropouts decreasing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student records School records Questionnaires. Structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators. Participant portfolios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student learning outcomes. Cognitive (performance and achievement). Affective (attitudes and dispositions). Psychomotor (skills and behaviors). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation, and follow-up. To demonstrate the overall impact of professional development.

Appendix F - Proposal Review Rubric

Montana Office of Public Instruction

ESEA Title II, Part B – Mathematics and Science Partnership (MSP) Program

PARTNERSHIP – CATEGORY 1 AND CATEGORY 2 GRANTS

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is not a complete description of the partnership including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. who are the partners b. how it was developed and is there evidence of ongoing collaboration in the design and implementation of the partnership c. how the duties and responsibilities are shared between the partners d. how will the communication be facilitated between the partners 2) There is little or no evidence that there is sufficient capacity in the partnership to organize and manage the project 3) There is no evidence that the required core planning team will be assembled 4) There is not a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed both during the development and operation time frame 	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is a complete description of the partnership including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. who are the partners b. how it was developed and is there evidence of ongoing collaboration in the design and implementation of the partnership c. how the duties and responsibilities are shared between the partners d. how will the communication be facilitated between the partners 2) There is evidence that there is sufficient capacity in the partnership to organize and manage the project 3) There is evidence that the required core planning team will be assembled 4) There is a complete description of how the effectiveness of the partnership will be assessed both during the development and operation time frame

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (2X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

SUMMER INSTITUTE DESIGN – CATEGORY 2 GRANTS ONLY

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The summer institute is not at least two weeks in length2) The summer institute does not have all of the following components and/or they are not completely described:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. professional development by STEM faculty to improve teacher content knowledge in math or scienceb. professional development that models research based instructional strategiesc. professional development in one particular research based strategyd. professional development that will increase teachers' understanding the critical role of local and Montana standardse. participants work with relevant curriculum and instructional material3) There is no description of how the required follow-up professional development will be provided	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The summer institute is at least two weeks in length2) The summer institute does have all of the following components and they are completely described:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. professional development by STEM faculty to improve teacher content knowledge in math or scienceb. professional development that models research based instructional strategiesc. professional development in one particular research based strategyd. professional development that will increase teachers' understanding the critical role of local and Montana standardse. participants work with relevant curriculum and instructional material3) There is a complete description of how the required follow-up professional development will be provided

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT AND SUSTAINABILITY FOR PARTICIPANTS - CATEGORY 2 GRANTS ONLY

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) There is not a complete description of how the project will provide for implementation support and sustainability for the instructional pedagogy that is part of the professional development training including:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, practice with feedbackb. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance with the classroom implementationc. how the project will insure the meaningful involvement of school and district leadership2) There is not a complete description of a process for the replication of the training for a successful strategy within the school or district – systemic change	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) There is a complete description of how the project will provide for implementation support and sustainability for the instructional pedagogy that is part of the professional development training including:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. how time will be provided for ongoing study, practice, practice with feedbackb. how the project will facilitate targeted professional development for teachers who need more intensive or in-depth assistance with the classroom implementationc. how the project will insure the meaningful involvement of school and district leadership2) There is a complete description of a process for the replication of the training for a successful strategy within the school or district – systemic change

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (2X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN – CATEGORY 1 GRANTS

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will insure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) in the following component areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Increasing the involvement of math and science teachersb. content knowledge professional developmentc. instructional strategy professional development including implementation assessmentd. assessing the ability of teachers to understand and use the challenging local and Montana Content and Performance Standards <p>2) All applicable levels of the Guskey model were not addressed</p> <p>3) There is not a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is not a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies</p>	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is a complete description of how the project will insure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) in the following component areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Increasing the involvement of math and science teachersb. content knowledge professional developmentc. instructional strategy professional development including implementation assessmentd. assessing the ability of teachers to understand and use the challenging local and Montana Content and Performance Standards <p>2) All applicable levels of the Guskey models were addressed</p> <p>3) There is a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies</p>

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (2X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN – CATEGORY 2 GRANTS

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is not a complete description of how the project will insure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) in the following component areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Increasing the involvement of math and science teachersb. content knowledge professional developmentc. instructional strategy professional development including implementation assessmentd. assessing the ability of teachers to understand and use the challenging local and Montana Content and Performance Standardse. operation of the summer institute <p>2) All applicable levels of the Guskey model were not addressed</p> <p>3) There is not a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is not a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies</p>	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is a complete description of how the project will insure the development of an effective and comprehensive assessment and accountability process (including applicable measurable objectives) in the following component areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Increasing the involvement of math and science teachersb. content knowledge professional developmentc. instructional strategy professional development including implementation assessmentd. assessing the ability of teachers to understand and use the challenging local and Montana Content and Performance Standardse. operation of the summer institute <p>2) All applicable levels of the Guskey model were addressed</p> <p>3) here is a complete description of what formative evaluation process will be used during implementation to identify barriers and facilitating events or structures that informs the project's ongoing planning and implementation efforts</p> <p>4) There is a complete description of how the project will communicate and disseminate information on the project and subsequent professional development activities to appropriate and applicable constituencies</p>

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS – CATEGORY 1 AND CATEGORY 2 GRANTS

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is not a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget</p> <p>2) The budget is not in alignment with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative</p> <p>3) The amount assigned to a given portion of the budget seems either excessive or insufficient given the goals of the project</p> <p>4) All the required budget forms were not included</p>	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <p>1) There is a complete description outlining the basis for determining the amounts shown on the budget</p> <p>2) The budget is aligned with the activities described in the various parts of the grant proposal narrative</p> <p>3) The amount assigned to each portion of the budget is sufficient given the goals of the project</p> <p>4) All the required budget forms were included and complete</p>

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (2X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

OVERALL DESIGN AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT PLAN - CATEGORY 1 GRANTS

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is not a complete description of how the project will address all the focus criteria as outlined in Section III E. 2) There is not a complete description of the research base for the project components 3) There is not a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts 4) There is not a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing teachers' understanding of the critical role local and Montana Content and Performance Standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction will be achieved 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were not addressed 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is low. 	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is a complete description of how the project will address all the focus criteria as outlined in Section III E. 2) There is a complete description of the research base for the project components 3) There is a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts 4) There is a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing teachers' understanding of the critical role local and Montana Content and Performance Standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction will be achieved 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were adequately addressed 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is moderate to high.

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (3X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____

OVERALL DESIGN AND EFFICACY OF PROJECT PLAN - CATEGORY 2 GRANTS

0 – 3 Points	4 – 9 Points
<p>Project proposal does not address, or does not meet the minimum expectations for sufficiently addressing, the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is not a complete description of how the project will target both the goal of increasing teachers' content knowledge and the goal of increasing teachers' use of an effective, research-based instructional strategies when designing professional development activities 2) There is not a complete description of the research base for the project components 3) There is not a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts 4) There is not a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing teachers' understanding of the critical role local and Montana Content and Performance Standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction will be achieved 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were not addressed 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is low 	<p>Project proposal clearly meets or exceeds the expectations for sufficiently addressing all of the critical attributes listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is a complete description of how the project will target both the goal of increasing teachers' content knowledge and the goal of increasing teachers' use of an effective, research-based instructional strategies when designing professional development activities 2) There is a complete description of the research base for the project components 3) There is a complete description of a process to identify and build on previous professional development work in the schools and districts 4) There is a complete description of how the ongoing goal of increasing teachers' understanding of the critical role local and Montana Content and Performance Standards in the design and delivery of effective instruction will be achieved 5) All applicable sections of the partnership operational narrative were adequately addressed 6) The likelihood of the overall plan being effective is moderate to high.

INITIAL SCORE: _____

FINAL SCORE - WEIGHT FACTOR (4X THE INITIAL SCORE): _____